

From: McComb <mccombb@peak.org>
Date: December 31, 2018 at 5:33:05 PM PST
To: OLIVOS-ROOD Hilary <Hilary.Olivos-rood@oregon.gov>
Cc: DAUGHERTY Peter <Peter.DAUGHERTY@oregon.gov>
Subject: Re: B. McComb Schedule for January 2nd

Hi Hilary,

This message is for Lena -- sorry it is so late, but I have been working my way through the materials.

Hi Lena,

After reviewing the materials that Hilary sent to me from you, it is clear that the reported compliance rates are inaccurate as stated. There are several sources of potential errors that are not acknowledged nor incorporated into estimates of error associated with the estimates:

1. The non-respondents to the initial mailing represent a potential non-response bias and that should have been estimated and documented. These were not sampled and we do not know what their compliance rates are, so the variability in potential non-compliance, from 0-100% of this portion of the sample, needs to be reflected in the 95% CI of the estimate.
2. Those landowners who refuse access to their lands represent a significant source of error that needs to be quantified, or the error rates associated with compliance estimates need to reflect the uncertainty associated with landowner refusal of access. These were not sampled and we do not know what their compliance rates are, so the variability in potential non-compliance, from 0-100% of this portion of the sample, needs to be reflected in the 95% CI of the the estimate
3. The criteria used to assess contractor data quality list acceptable levels of error for each variable measured. These error rates vary form variable to variable, and were not incorporated into error rates for compliance estimates.
4. The compliance estimates provided do not have associated error rates that are based on sample sizes and proportions (z-estimates at 95% CI) and more importantly do not incorporate the uncertainty associated with the three items listed above.

I have some questions as well, but these are my primary concerns and certainly hope that these results are not being reported out as they are in the documents.

At the very least the estimates should have associated error rates and the title of the tables should clearly state that these estimates are only applicable to those landowners who allowed access to their lands and should not be applied to all harvest units in the state.

See you on Wednesday,
Brenda